

FISCAL NOTE

Bill #: HB0249

Title: Wildlife removal in cities based upon ordinance or resolution

Primary Sponsor: Barrett, D

Status: As Introduced

Sponsor signature	Date	Chuck Swysgood, Budget Director	Date
-------------------	------	---------------------------------	------

Fiscal Summary

	<u>FY 2004 Difference</u>	<u>FY 2005 Difference</u>
Expenditures:		
General Fund	\$0	\$0
State Special Revenue	\$925,442	\$527,933
Net Impact on General Fund Balance:	\$0	\$0

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Local Gov. Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Technical Concerns |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Included in the Executive Budget | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Significant Long-Term Impacts |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dedicated Revenue Form Attached | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needs to be included in HB 2 |

Fiscal Analysis

ASSUMPTIONS:

1. The game animal removal work will be performed by FWP.
2. If all consolidated governments adopt the proposed ordinance, the following maximum costs would be incurred.
 - a. As game animals are removed, others will enter the open niche, resulting in an on-going need for animal removal.
 - b. FWP would need an estimated average density of 0.50 FTE per warden district (69 warden districts) for adequate coverage and timely response for expected workload. (69 X 0.50 FTE = 34.50 FTE)
 - c. Additional staff to provide this service will be paid at entry level within the technical pay band, job code #440504, at \$9.848 per hour plus 25 percent benefits. ($\$9.848 \times 2,080 \times 34.50 = \$709,692$ X 1.25 = \$883,366)
 - d. Start-up costs for the first year would require a 3/4 ton HD pickup at \$20,044 per FTE and operation expenses of \$8,000 per FTE in 2004. These funds would be used for acquiring and outfitting large and/or dangerous animal immobilization and capture equipment as well as the actual cost of operations, such as mileage and per diem. On-going expenses of \$5,000 per FTE for FY 2005 and beyond would be needed for mileage, per diem, and replacement of immobilization supplies and maintenance of capture and transport equipment. FY 2004 = $(\$20,044 \times 34.50) + (\$8,000 \times 34.5) = \$691,518 + \$276,000 = \$961,518$; FY 2005 = $(\$5,000 \times 34.50) = \$172,500$.

Fiscal Note Request HB0249, As Introduced
(continued)

3. The consolidated governments whose populations vote to adopt the proposed ordinance could range from 0 percent to 100 percent. For purposes of this fiscal note, FWP projects that 50 percent of all consolidated governments will adopt the proposed ordinance. 34.50 FTE X 50 percent = 17.25 FTE; Personal Services: \$883,366 X 50 percent = \$441,683; Operations: (FY 2004: \$276,000 X 50 percent = \$138,000; FY 2005: \$172,500 X 50 percent = 86,250); Equipment: \$691,518 X 50 percent = \$345,759.
4. Another avenue to implement this bill would include using the private sector. At this time, we have no information to estimate those costs.

FISCAL IMPACT:

	FY 2004 <u>Difference</u>	FY 2005 <u>Difference</u>
FTE	17.25	17.25
<u>Expenditures:</u>		
Personal Services	\$441,683	\$441,683
Operating Expenses	138,000	86,250
Equipment	345,759	0
TOTAL	\$925,442	\$527,933
<u>Funding of Expenditures:</u>		
State Special Revenue (02)	\$925,442	\$527,933
<u>Net Impact to Fund Balance (Revenue minus Funding of Expenditures):</u>		
State Special Revenue (02)	(\$925,442)	(\$527,933)

LONG-RANGE IMPACTS:

Funding for this proposal is proposed under 87-1-242, MCA. These revenues are currently being used to secure, develop and maintain wildlife habitat, resulting in less revenue available for wildlife habitat purposes.